



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—ON THE CONSONANT DECLENSION IN OLD NORSE.¹

I.

Two opinions as to the origin and development of the consonant stems in the Teutonic languages prevail. The first is that to which J. Grimm gave expression in his *Gramm.* I. 610 sqq., and which Delbrück, Heinzel and others adopted, viz., that these consonant stems arose from a gradual fretting away and contraction of the common forms of the vowel declension. The second is that advanced by the later grammarians, as Kelle, Scherer, Lyngby, Wimmer, Bugge, viz., that the present consonant declension has been received in unbroken succession from the Aryan language, although much distorted and disfigured in its progress by becoming mixed with the vowel declension. The advocates of the former theory explain the peculiarities of the consonant declension by a loss of the characteristic vowel of the stem and other deviations from the common declension necessarily caused by this loss; the advocates of the latter theory on the other hand explain the same peculiarities by a transition into the vowel declension, by irregularities arising in the declension from the influence which analogous forms of the other declensions may have exercised, thus disturbing the regular development. In view of the new facts which the researches of the first part of this work have brought to light, it will perhaps not be altogether useless to review the reasons adduced in support of theories so entirely different, inasmuch as it will not be undesirable to have the scattered remarks collected, and, moreover, this will afford us an excellent opportunity of confirming much that has

¹ These remarks are based upon an investigation entitled: 'Die consonantische Declination in den germanischen Sprachen. I Abtheilung: Die consonantische Declination im Altnordischen.' The first part of this work, containing a summary of the present state and progress of investigation on this subject, an index of works used, and a list of the consonant stems with passages showing their declension, was published by Karl Trübner, Strassburg, 1880, after having been presented to the philosophical faculty of the University of Strassburg for the doctor's degree. In the following remarks frequent reference will be made to this first part, as all the examples cannot be cited here.

hitherto only been conjecture, and of rectifying much that rested on a false conception of these forms. But in order to arrive at any kind of a satisfactory result in our investigation, it will be best to give briefly the changes caused by the 'auslautsgesetze' as generally accepted, and by the several steps in the development of the language, beginning with the common Teutonic and tracing it down to each separate dialect, in order to obtain a secure basis for our further investigation.

The stem *borg-* (we assume that the progression of the mutes is already completed) considered as a consonant stem must have been declined in common Teutonic (the endings of Scherer G. D. S. 422 are here employed) as follows :

	Sing.	Plur.
n.	<i>borg- s</i>	<i>borg-as</i>
g.	<i>borg-as</i>	<i>borg-âm</i>
d. (loc.)	<i>borg-i</i>	<i>borg-mis</i>
ac.	<i>borg-am</i>	<i>borg-as</i>

After the auslautsgesetze had operated we should have :

	Goth.	O. N.	O. E.	O. H. G.
n.	<i>baurgs</i>	<i>borg</i>	<i>burg</i>	<i>burg</i>
g.	<i>baurgs</i>	<i>borgr</i>	<i>burg</i>	<i>burg</i>
d. (loc.)	<i>baurg</i>	<i>borg</i>	<i>burg</i>	<i>burg</i>
ac.	<i>baurg</i>	<i>borg</i>	<i>burg</i>	<i>burg</i>

	Plur.			
n.	<i>baurgs</i>	<i>borgr</i>	<i>burg</i>	<i>burg</i>
g.	<i>baurgê</i>	<i>borga</i>	<i>burga</i>	<i>burgo</i>
d.	<i>baurg(*<u>m</u>)</i>	<i>borg(*<u>m</u>)</i>	<i>burg(*<u>m</u>)</i>	<i>burg(*<u>m</u>)</i>
ac.	<i>baurgs</i>	<i>borgr</i>	<i>burg</i>	<i>burg.</i>

It is, however, only in Gothic that the consonant declension appears in the form which we should naturally expect, and even here it shows a strong mixture with the vowel declension; according to the above paradigm are declined either wholly or partially: *alhs baurgs dulps (gup) mans miluks nahts reiks spaurds vaihts (pruts)* and some compounds like *mênôths fijands mitaths veit-vôds* and others. In the other dialects the vowel forms are frequent, nay in very many cases more frequent than the consonant forms, which they seem almost to have suppressed. Thus in the very beginning of our investigation we are met with the question which

are really the original forms, and how have the others, the vowel forms, or according to the other theory the consonant forms, forced their way in? An answer to this question which should be at all satisfactory would require a thorough investigation of the history and development of all the declensions in the Teutonic group, of the gradual mixing up of the same, of the slow but sure decay and disappearance of the consonant and *u*- and *i*- declensions, and of the aggressions of the *a*- declension, a thing which cannot, of course, be attempted here on account of its length. Only the principal characteristics of the consonant declension, viz., the umlaut question (in O. N., O. E. and O. Frise) and the transition from the vowel declension into the consonant, or vice versa, will be treated, which the question of the disappearance of the suffixal *a* will involve, because of its bearing upon the umlaut question. Even these questions cannot be so satisfactorily discussed as could be wished in the present confused state of the declension, especially in Old Norse, which alone must almost entirely decide the principal problem, the umlaut. We will begin, then, with the much contested umlaut question.

The strict adherents of the *auslautsgesetz* discovered by Westphal and developed by Scherer, maintain that there can be no umlaut in the n. ac. pl. of these stems, as the vowel of the ending *-as* had before the beginning of the umlaut period already fallen a victim to this law, and therefore these umlauting stems are not genuine consonant stems, but are rather to be classed among the *u*- (relatively *i*-) stems which have lost their characteristic vowel in the course of the development of the language, whereas others, on the other hand, not so firmly believing in the infallibility of the working of the law, say that these particular stems make an exception to the law: they form the rear-guard and have preserved their suffixal vowel until after the appearance of the umlaut, through a special act of indulgence on the part of the law. Almost of the same purport is the opinion that the *auslautsgesetz* is not a feature of the primitive Teutonic, but made its appearance much later than is generally believed, has in fact received an almost if not entirely independent development in each particular dialect, in one earlier, in the other later, and that these stems have retained their suffixal vowel until after the appearance of the umlaut, on account of a later and special development of the law in these particular dialects: for this opinion like the other exempts a whole class of words in the dialect itself from the working of a general law of this dialect. We shall return to this point again.

The opinion that the consonant stems are old *u*-stems was first advocated (if I mistake not) by Lünig in his edition of the Edda, pp. 121-124 sqq., and by Pfeiffer in his Old Norse Reader, but found its principal defender in the north, in Gislason, *Tid. for fil. og paed.* vi. 236-253 in a critique of K. L. Lyngby's *De old-nordiske Navneords Bøjning*, *Tid. for fil. og paed.* vi. 20-53, in which Lyngby explains these stems as genuine consonant stems. Gislason, appealing to the authority of Grimm, Rask, Lünig, Pfeiffer, gave a prominence to this theory which it had never yet attained. Gislason's proofs were easily refuted by Wimmer in *Navneordenes Bøjning i aeldre Dansk* p. 81 sqq., and by Bugge in *Aarb.* 1870, p. 210 sqq., and the former opinion of Lyngby was again raised to the seat of honor which it had so long occupied. Gislason's opinion, however, found at least recognition in Germany; Heinzel: *Ueber die Endsilben in der nordischen Sprache* p. 98 (438) admits its possibility, nay even its probability, and Scherer *G. D. S.* 435-442 explains *tæð fet bræðer* as *u*-stems. Yet the other opinion, Lyngby's, still enjoys the widest acceptance. But the theory of original *u*- or *i*-stems and that of original consonant stems being diametrically opposed, it will be necessary to begin with a thorough investigation of the reasons for and against each of these theories, as the question of priority in regard to the original form of these stems will form an important item in the explanation of the umlaut question. The question then resolves itself into this: Is the umlaut organic or inorganic? Is it the result of the *a* (weakened to *i*) of the n. pl. ending *-as* which has been spared either by the general *'auslautsgesetz* or, in case of a dialectical development, by a special *'auslautsgesetz*? Or is the umlaut due to the influence of the *u*- and *i*-stems, perhaps also of the *ja*- (*jā*-) stems which have passed into the consonant declension, and have paid for the umlaut by the loss of the vowel in these cases through the influence of the genuine consonant stems? If they are, on the other hand, old *u*- and *i*-stems, how are their deviations from the rest of the *u*- and *i*-stems to be explained?

No extended proof is needed to show that most of these stems in Old Norse are deserters from the vowel declension; the decision of the whole question therefore depends upon the nature of the very few stems which show consonant forms in Gothic, Old English, Old Frise, Old Saxon and Old High German; for only by means of a decision of the nature of these stems which were once (at least in Sanskrit, Greek and Latin) consonant stems, can we

arrive at a decision of the whole question. Closely connected with these few (original) consonant stems are the names of relationship, the present participles and the *t*-stems, all of which originally followed the consonant declension. The question then is either to prove a transition of these consonant stems into the vowel declension, or to admit frankly a consonant declension in the Teutonic languages and explain the umlaut as best we may.

According to the above statement there are four groups of the consonant stems in Old Norse: I. the *-u-* and *-i-* (relatively *-a-* and *-n-*) stems; as masc. *fótr*, *fingr*, *þráðr*, fem. *nótt*, *bók*, *mörk*, *gás*, *mús*, etc.; those originally ending in a vowel also belong here, as *kýr*, *sýr*, *aer*, *fló*, etc. II. the names of relationship. III. the present participles. IV. the *t*-stems. Let us consider the four groups in turn.

Group I forms two subdivisions: (a) *u*-stems, masc. *fótr*, *maðr*, *vetr*, *þráðr*; fem. *hönd*, *kinn*, *tönn*, *dyrr* (pl., f. and n.); (b) the *i-* (relatively *a-*, *n-*) stems; masc. *fingr*, *nagl*; fem. *nótt*, *bók*, *mörk*, *gás*, etc.

"The comparison (of the Norse) with the Gothic," says Lyngby in the above mentioned work (Tid. for fil. og paed. vi 40 sqq.), "stands the test but in part; all the more remarkable, therefore, is the coincidence of the Old Norse words with the words in the closely related languages outside of our own family. Not only does the plural *naet-r* = Goth. **nahts*, correspond to Greek *νόχτ-ες*, but also *foet-r* to Greek *πόδ-ες*, Skr. n. pl. *pad-as*, ac. pl. *pad-ds* (B. R. Dict.) from *pad-*, notwithstanding that the Gothic has *fótjus*; *tenn-r* or *tenn* to Greek *τόδοντ-ες*, Skr. *dat-as* (ac. pl.), notwithstanding that the Gothic has in the ac. pl. *tunþuns*; *gaes-s* with Greek *χῆν-ες* from **χένσ-ες*; *mýs-s* to Greek *μύσ-ες* from *μύσ-ες*; *dyr-r* to the Skr. stem *dvār*, *dur* (fem.); *endr* to the Latin *anat-* (n. sg. *anas*)." Comp. moreover his objection to the theory of *u-*, *i-* stems, p. 41.

The correspondence here, however, is only apparent, for leaving out of consideration for the present the question as to whether the *auslautsgesetz* has spared the vowel of the ending *-as*, an inner change has taken place in every one of the examples just cited either in Teutonic or in Greek. Even the Greek form of the stem (*ποδ-* = Skr. *pad-*) no longer corresponds to the Latin form of the same (*ped-* = Skr. *pad-*), and even if *ποδ-* can, according to Brugman (Curtius' Stud. IX 368 sqq.), be explained as coming from the strong form of the stem (*pad-*) and *ped-* from the weak form

(*pad-*), that does not at all explain the long vowel in the Teutonic *fôt-*. Johannes Schmidt has recently cleared up the length of the vowel, if his explanation advanced in Kuhn's Zeitschr. n. f. V. p. 13 is true (*fôt-* = Dor. $\pi\acute{o}\tau$ = Skr. *pât-*, thus a stem with a long vowel in the European group), but the rare occurrence of the word in these languages still leaves it doubtful whether it was a vowel or consonant stem.¹ If it was really an original consonant stem, as Johannes Schmidt maintains, the Teutonic has certainly changed it to a vowel stem; for we find here only an *u-* stem in Gothic, with which the O. N. singular *fótr*, *fótar*, *foeti*, *fôt*, n. pl. (in the Gutal. at least) *fýtir* (cf. List I 26), O. H. G. *fuoz*, *fuozzi*, d. pl. *fuozzin*,² O. S. d. sg. *fuoti*, ac. pl. *fôti* (also O. E., O. Frise *fôt*, *fêl(i)*) accord in the most perfect manner. Thus in order that the would-be resemblance between O. N. *foet-r* and Greek $\pi\acute{o}\delta$ -ες may hold good in any respect whatever, we must assume that the O. N. *fótr* (O. E., O. Frise *fôt*) has retained the original consonant stem (and this the long vowel and the O. N. singular lead us to reject), which necessitates the assumption of two distinct lines of development of the word in the Teutonic languages, a thing not at all likely in this instance, as we shall see later. We see, therefore, that neither *foet-r* nor $\pi\acute{o}\delta$ -ες shows an uninterrupted development from Skr. *pad-*.

Maðr presents great difficulties at the very beginning. If O. N., O. E., O. Frise (ac. pl. *men*, cf. List I 51) n. ac. pl. *menn* is to be explained from the Gothic n. ac. pl. *mans*, we must admit a tolerably late appearance of the auslautsgesetz in these languages in order to explain the umlaut; if on the other hand we consider it an *u-* stem, the Gothic *mans*, O. H. G., O. S., O. Frise (*mon*, *man*) *man* are inexplicable. An explanation that will help us out of this dilemma is in fact a solution of the whole question. If *menn* corresponds to *mans* in every respect, then there can be no longer any doubt that these stems are really consonant stems and the umlaut is then due to the *a* (*i*) of the ending *-as*. Let us, therefore, briefly consider the development of this word in the Teutonic group.

The Gothic (and most of the O. H. G., O. S., and O. Frise) forms of this word have already been sufficiently explained by Scherer in the Anz. f. d. a. IV 546 sqq. The only remaining

¹Comp. now Hermann Möller in P. B. VII 498.

²It will not be necessary to state here that the *u-* stems in O. H. G. have passed into the *i-* declension, departing from n. ac. pl. in *i* = Got. *jus*.

question is whether this explanation may also be applied to the Old Norse, Old English and Old Frise (ac. pl. *men*). If one is not inclined to admit a later appearance of the auslautsgesetz here than elsewhere, the umlaut can be explained in O. E. d. sg. *menn* (in O. N. the whole singular has passed into the *a*-declension) and O. N., O. E., O. Frise n. ac. pl. *menn* only as inorganic, in other words it is left entirely unexplained. In this light O. N. *mennir* (*nir*) would be a form analogous to the n. pl. of the masc. *u*- and *i*-stems. In my opinion the relation of the different forms is quite another. We must start with Scherer from the Skr. *manú*, an old *u*-stem which in Gothic (and mostly in O. H. G., O. S., and Old Frise) has passed into the consonant declension. Two substantives come here under consideration, our word *mann*- (Gothic) and *kinnu*-. We must start here, of course, from those cases in which the *v* stands before vowels (cf. on this point Kuhn in his Zeitschr. II 460, Leo Meyer Got. Spr. § 204, Verner, Germanisch *nn* in Zeitschr. f. d. a. 21, 425 sqq.), therefore from the weak cases, and assume with Scherer non-augmentation of the *v*. We should have therefore in the primitive Teutonic:

	Sing.	Plur.
n.	<i>manus genus</i>	<i>manvas genvas</i>
g.	<i>manvas genvas</i>	<i>manvám genvám</i>
d. (loc.)	<i>manvi genvi</i>	<i>manumis genumis</i>
ac.	<i>manum genum</i>	<i>manuns genuns.</i>

Accordingly in the g. d. sg., n. g. pl. assimilation of the *v* to the preceding *n* is possible, from whence it could make its way into all cases. But as the unaugmented vowel in the *u*- and *i*-stems seldom appears even in Sanskrit, the conjecture is not absolutely improbable that the regular forms with augmented vowel stood a long time side by side with the above forms; or rather the unaugmented vowel appeared only in some of the possible cases. Two courses are therefore possible in the further development of these words. If the unaugmented vowel stood in every one of the possible cases, it would have been the purest accident if the word had not become a consonant stem, as has been the case in the Gothic *mans*. If, however, the unaugmented vowel made its way into only a few of the possible cases, the cases retaining the *u*, as in the Gothic *kinnus*, would decide the nature of the declension. This is all the easier of comprehension when we remember that the ac. sg. and d. pl. are two very important factors in causing a transition from the

consonant to the *u*- declension, and in fact for the coloring in general of the declension in Teutonic. Therefore the *u*- stem of *kinnus* could not only maintain itself against the aggressions of the new forms, but also drive out the few consonant forms arising from the g. d. sg. and n. g. plur.

Perhaps we shall now be able to find a possible, if not the probable, explanation of the Gothic *mans*, O. H. G., O. S., O. Frise *man* (n. ac. pl.) in contradistinction to the Old Norse, Old English, Old Frise *menn* (n. ac. pl.) without having recourse to the acceptance of an act of violation of the prevailing laws of development in the language. Just as *mans* in Gothic chose the one way, but *kinnus* the other, in exactly the same manner we can conceive that of two sister languages the one may have chosen one way and the other the other with reference to the same word. Thus as the Gothic, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Frise developed from the old *u*- stem *manús* a consonant stem, but from (*g*)*hánus* an *u*- stem, the Old Norse, Old English, Old Frise could in their turn develop quite as regularly from the same *manús* an *u*- stem. On the supposition that *foet-r*, *menn*, *hend-r*, *teinn*, and others are to be explained only by admission of *u*- and *i*- stems, this assumption becomes necessary. Whether the admission of *u*-, *i*- stems is at all necessary for the explanation of these words is a question that will occupy us at a later point in our investigation. Here our only aim has been to point out the possibility of a divergency in the development of a word in different dialects of the same family, and in this case there is a manifest reason for such an assumption in order to explain otherwise inexplicable forms. The necessity of the assumption will fall or be confirmed according as it can be proved that the umlaut of these stems can only be explained, nay must be explained by the admission of *u*- and *i*- stems. But the question of umlaut is not the only reason for assuming two different developments of the stem *manús* in Teutonic. Some forms of the O. H. G. and O. Frise point to another than a consonant stem, viz., O. H. G. d. pl. *mannim*, n. pl. *marcomanni*, *choufmanne*, ac. pl. *uuerkmanne* (cf. Graff 2, 740 sqq.), and O. Frise ac. pl. *mon*, *man* side by side with *men*, all forms that point plainly to an *u*- stem, just as the forms n. ac. pl. *fuozzi*, d. pl. *fuozzin*, point to a transition from the *u*- into the *i*- declension; O. Frise *fôt*, *fêt*, corresponds to *man*, pl. *men*, but not to *man*, pl. *mon*, *man*, as the umlaut here cannot be a matter of mere caprice or accident. *Vetr* and *práðr* still remain of the masculines, both found only in the Teutonic.

The first follows the *u*-declension in Gothic and partly also in Old English, in the d. sg. *wintra*, ac. pl. *wintru*, but in the other dialects it belongs to the *a*-declension. *præðr* shows more frequently *u*-forms in Old Norse, but besides these also n. ac. pl. *præðr*.

The feminines tell the same story as the masculines. *Hönd* is a purely Teutonic word, which follows in all the other dialects the *u*-declension; *kinn* has already been mentioned above. The history of *tönn* = Skr. *dant-*, *dat-*, is the same as that of *fótr*, having passed from the consonant into the *u*-declension (cf. List I 81, Brugman *Nasalis sonans* in Curtius' Stud. ix 335, Kluge Q. F. 32, 108). According to Brugman, *Zur Geschichte der abstufenden Deklination* in Curtius' Stud. ix 395, the Gothic *daur*(n.), *daurö*(f.), reflects the weak stem *dhur* (strong stem *dhva:r*). After this weak stem had succeeded in driving out the strong one we should have in the early stage of the language n. sg. **dur-(s)*, g. sg. **dur-as*, d. sg. (loc.) **dur-i*, ac. sg. **dur-m*, n. pl. **dur-as*, g. pl. **dur-äm*, d. pl. **dur-m(i)s*, ac. pl. **dur-ns*. The nasalis sonans becoming *um*, *un*, we should have in the ac. sg. **duru* (as in the case of the names of relation, which see below), d. pl. **durum*, ac. pl. **duruns*, hence through the influence of these cases comes the *u*-stem which we find in Old English *duru* (cf. List I 22). But the nasalis sonans of the ac. sg. could be dropped after the analogy of the mute stems (cf. names of relation below), so that we should thus have a flexionless singular, which probably gave us the neuter *daur* of the Gothic. The Old High German singular *turi* is simply a transfer of the plural, which was often employed in the sense of the singular (cf. Graff 5, 445), and this plural *turi* (= O. S. *duri* = *januas* Ps. 73, 6) has penetrated into all the cases of both plural and singular from n. ac. pl. *turi*, forms of an *u*-stem just as we have in *fuoizzi*, *henti*, and others.

This finishes group I (a) in which we find *u*-forms in some one of the dialects. But even considered as *u*-stems, these words show in the three dialects (O. N., O. E., O. Frise) such irregularities as exclude them from the regular *u*-declension without a satisfactory explanation of the causes producing the same; thus these words are in the n. ac. pl. *foetr*, *menn(r)*, *hendr*, *kinnr*, *tenn(r)*, *dyrr*, whereas the regular forms should be *foetir*, *fötu*, *mennir*, *mönnu*, *hendir*, *höndu*, *kinnir*, *kinnu*, *tennir*, *tönnu*, *dyrir*, *duru*. Why this deviation from the regular declension? Lyngby urges this very deviation in the declension of these words as a proof against the theory of *u*-stems and prefers to consider them as genuine consonant stems

corresponding to the Skr. and Gr. words. But we have already seen that his comparison does not prove entirely satisfactory in group I (a); let us now examine group I (b) and see if his comparison of these words is just.

We have here masc. *fingr*, *nagl*, fem. *nótt*, *bók*, *mörk*, *gás*, *mús*, etc. *Fingr*, a Teutonic word, points everywhere to an *a*-stem, still not without exception, viz., in O. H. G. in the d. pl. we find *fingerin*, in the g. pl. *fingeri* (N. II), in the ac. pl. *fingeri* (Bib. 7) (cf. List I 23; Graff 3, 527). Gen. and ac. pl. rest solely on Graff's authority, but the d. pl. clearly shows that we have here at least real *i*-forms, which the O. Frise d. pl. *fingeren* confirms: at the same time the Old Frise n. pl. *fiŋgar*, d. sg. *fiŋger*, conform rather to O. N. *fingr* (considered as a consonant stem). A mixture of two stems (*a*- and *i*-) is here evident. *Nagl* tells the same story as *fingr*; in most of the dialects it is an *a*-stem, shows, however, forms in *i* in O. H. G. (cf. List I 55). The O. Frise also shows the same peculiarities as in the case of *fiŋgar*; thus d. sg. *neile* and *neil*: *ette wrsta knocla by dae neyl xii peninghen*. W. 468, 1; d. pl. *neilon*, *neilen*: *dat hi so diepe ende dimme mitta flower neylen is*. W. 47, 15.

Most of the feminines of this class manifestly partake of the peculiarities of the consonant stems only through a transition from their original vowel declension, being mostly in fact *û*- and *n*-stems, as *mörk*, *rönd*, *stöng*, etc., and offer nothing whatever for the decision of our question. Others, however, have great weight and must be carefully compared with the same words in the sister languages. It is true that the Gothic n. pl. *naht-s* corresponds to the Greek *νόχτ-ες*, but whether the Old Norse *noet-r* likewise corresponds to the same *νόχτ-ες* is quite another question. Before we can confidently make this assertion the history and development of the word in the two sister languages must be more closely considered. The generally accepted derivation of *nahts* from the root *nak*- to harm, by the addition of the suffix *-ti-*, was first proposed by Bopp Vgl. Gramm.³ § 276, which would make our word an *i*-stem. Waiving a discussion of the different derivations proposed for *nahts* as being entirely irrelevant to the present question, it answers our purpose to know that this word is an *i*-stem in five different languages (cf. Curtius Grdz.⁵ 163). The Greek consonant stem has therefore only become so by the loss of an *i* after dentals, not a very frequent appearance in Greek, but yet not an unheard of one (cf. Curtius Grdz.⁵ 644). And this I believe to be

also the case in Gothic, where, as I hope to prove later in the progress of this investigation, the dropping of an *i* after dentals though rare is still more frequent than in Greek, and the Old High German shows a growing tendency to drop its *i*'s after dentals. This opinion is moreover substantially confirmed by the other Teutonic dialects, which show mostly *i*-forms, much more seldom consonant forms, a circumstance easily explained by the dropping of the *i* after dentals. Thus again the decision of *noet-r* depends solely upon the decision of the umlaut question. It can have taken the consonant stem as in Gothic, with which it would naturally, as one of the East Teutonic group, have very close affinities, or it can here as in most of the other dialects have retained the *i*-stem; the decision of the umlaut alone will be able to settle this question definitely. *Bók*-, Gothic *bōka*-, appears to be in Teutonic an original *a*-stem, shows, however, in different dialects *i*-forms; thus O. S. n. pl. *buoki*, O. H. G. g. sg. *buochi* (cf. List I 13): in Otfrid on account of the metre, d. pl. *buochin* (syl.), *buochen*, *ex libris fone dine buochen*, N. 11, 14, *so er an buochen geboten habet*, N. 60, 8. From these forms in *i* in Old Saxon and Old High German, and from the fact that the Old Norse in the g. sg. n. ac. pl., the Old English in the d. sg. n. ac. pl. show the umlaut, I conjecture that this word had at one time, perhaps in early Teutonic, two stems, an *a*-stem and an *i*-stem. The comparison with the Greek *φηγύς*, Lat. *fāgu-s*, provided this derivation be the right one, indicates an original *a*-stem.

Moreover, *gaes-s* corresponds to the Greek *χῆν-ες*, *mýs-s* to the Greek *μῦ-ες*, *dýr-r* to the Sanskrit *dvār* or *dur*, *end-r* to the Latin *anat*-. As to the first of these words there are two original stems: **ghansa*-(m.) and **ghansi*-(f.), Skr. *haṁsa*-(m.) and *haṁsi*-(f.). According to Čurtius Grdz.⁵ 200 the Greek *χῆν* stands for **χῆνς*, as *μῆν* for **μῆνς*, or rather for **χῆνσι*, as the European base is, without doubt, derived from the feminine **ghansi*- (cf. Lit. *žąsi-s*, O. Slav. *gąsi*, Old Irish *geiss* [*mag da gési*, "Plain of the two swans,"]: thus, it became in Greek a consonant stem only by an inner change, and, at the same time, by the loss of its characteristic vowel. On Teutonic territory it has, however, remained an *i*-stem (= Skr. *haṁsi*-; cf. List I. 30), which the forms in every dialect sufficiently prove (in Old Norse and Old English by the umlaut and the gen. sg. *gōse* in O. E.) *Mýs-s* = *μῦ-ες*. The Sanskrit offers three stems: *mūsh*-(m.), *mūsha*-(m. f.), *mūshi*-(f.; cf. BR). It is noticeable in this word that the Greek *μῦς*, Lat. *mūs*, are masculines as a general

rule, whereas the Teutonic *músi-*, O. Slav. *myši*, are feminines. In Greek and Latin, therefore, the consonant stem *mús-* has prevailed (Lat. g. pl. *murium*, sometimes also *murum*, is a later transition into the *i*-declension); for the other European languages, however, only the *i*-stem can be accepted (cf. List I. 54). *Lúsi-* shows a similar result, the *i*-forms of most of the dialects compel us to accept an *i*-stem. For *dyr-r* cf. above. Finally *end-r* = *anat-*. If, however, the relation assumed by Fick IV 16, Curtius Grdz.⁵ 317, with the Skr. *úti-s* be right, this stem is also an original *i*-stem which opinion the Lit. *ánti-s*, O. Slav. *aty*, seems to corroborate (cf. List I. 6). Be this as it may, the other Teutonic dialects show only *i*-forms, and in Old Norse the n. pl. *andir* is the oldest, nay, the only form in the Grágás, just as *dlptir*—which is beyond all doubt an *i*-stem—is also the only form of this word in the Grágás; *endr* and *elptr* are found only in the Karlamagnússaga, and are unquestionably only formations after the analogy of *noetr*, *hendr*, etc.

From this comparison we learn two facts: the words compared with the Greek words have undergone an inner change either in one or in both of these languages at the same time, as in *fótr*, *maðr*, *kinn*, *tönn*, *dyrr*, in Teutonic, by which they have passed from the consonant into the vowel-declension (in most of the dialects at least), as *fótr*, *tönn*, *dyrr* into the *u*-declension, or *vice versa*, as *mans* in Goth., O. Frise, O. S., O. H. G., and *nahts* in Gothic, or as in *χῆν* in Greek; secondly, originally two or more stems existed, of which the Greek took one, the Teutonic the other, as in the case of *mús* (m.), *músi*-(f.), so that the comparison is just in no case whatever.

One other fact is to be learned from this comparison: however true it is that the method of comparative investigation is of great importance in determining the original stems of words and their relations to the same words in other cognate languages, in no case is it able to determine the special coloring a stem will receive in the course of its development in the different languages, and is therefore not admissible in the decision of our question. The definite form of the declension is so much influenced by the inner development of every language in its own separate existence, by the principles of association, by special laws of vowel and consonant change peculiar perhaps only to one dialect, nay even sometimes by accident, that conclusions should not be too hastily drawn from apparent (outer) agreement. If we compare the umlauting stems (of the simple words) of the Old Norse, Old English and Old

Frise, with the corresponding stems in the other dialects, it will be clear to every one that most of them were originally vowel stems, a few others became so by a change in their form on Teutonic ground, others allow no decision whatever, yet it seems hardly doubtful that they were once so. If, on the one hand, the special laws of every language exclude or rather render inadmissible a comparison of cognate languages, they give, on the other hand, an important hint for the explanation of these peculiarities, i. e. they refer us to an independent development inside of the respective language itself. Left to this resource, let us attempt an explanation inside of the Old Norse, Old English and Old Frise.

We will begin with Gislason's theory, that these are old *u*-stems. His unfortunate comparison of the masculine *bógr* and the feminine *bók* (cf. Tid. for fil. og paed. vi 247-8) did anything but promote the explanation of our stems, as this comparison is no more tenable than that above of Lyngby, because *bók* is an original *a*-stem, which indeed often shows an inclination for *i*-, never, however, for *u*-forms. With still less reason can Heyne, Laut- und Flexionslehre 306, place *rót* among the *u*-stems, a word which shows neither *u*- nor *i*-forms. This opinion needs no refutation whatever, as many of these stems cannot have been old *u*-stems at all. Only on the supposition that they are analogous formations to *hönd* and other original *u*-stems could this theory be upheld. It was therefore an easy task for Wimmer and Bugge to reinstate the old opinion of consonant stems. One point only in Wimmer's refutation deserves attention here. "When Gislason," says Wimmer in Navneordenes Bøjning i ældre Dansk 81 sqq., "cites as proof against the presence of the Indo-Germanic *a* in the Old Norseumlaut in *boekr* that the Old Norse has not even spared the characteristic *a* (as shown) in the Skr. and Lit. *-as* of the n. sg., but on the contrary, while agreeing with the Gothic as it generally does, has not even retained a trace of it, this would certainly be a strong proof of the correctness of his explanation, provided we did not have, inside the Old Norse, monuments of the language proving that the Old Norse, in the very case cited by him himself, has preserved in its *a*-stems the characteristic vowel of the stem down to a period in which it had long ago been dropped in Gothic. The fact that the Gothic in the 4th century employed older forms in the above cases than the Old Norse in the 12th century is no reason that the Old Norse of the 4th century could not have shown older forms (than the Gothic) in many cases. Just as Vulfila's language

can justly be called the Sanskrit of the Gothic language (de "goteske" sprogs Sanskrit), so in the same manner the language of the oldest Old Norse inscriptions can justly be called the Vêda language of the Old Norse, as it preserves for us the fundamental forms of the Modern Old Norse. But as the vocabulary in these inscriptions is so small that scarcely more than the flexion of the substantive can with complete certainty be determined, the Gothic will constantly retain everywhere a great importance in the explanation of the Old Norse forms. Yet the language in these inscriptions shows that we must be careful not to assume without more ado that the Gothic forms are the fundamental forms of the Old Norse, even if this can be inferred with the greatest probability. If, then, the *a*-stems have preserved their characteristic vowel at least in the ac., even on the youngest of those stones containing older runes, I do not see anything to hinder us from assuming that *a* also, weakened to *i*, can have been preserved in the g. sg. and likewise in the n. ac. pl. of words like *boekr* in the forms of the early language from which the Old Norse was developed, even if *a* (*i*) was wanting in Gothic. A confirmation of this opinion, in fact, is presented by the second side of the stone of Tune, on which I find the n. pl. *dohtrir*. To be sure Gislason does not mention in his treatise the words of relationship in *-tar*-; and it was quite right of him to explain Old Norse *broeðr* from Gothic *brōðrjus* the same as *boekr* from **bōkjus*, **bōkjar*. But after having found *dohtrir* on the stone of Tune I cannot consider it anything else than the primary form for *doetr*, whereas I look upon Gothic *dohtrjus* as a special Gothic development called forth by the transition of the word into the *u*-class (cf. *sunjus*, *handjus*)."

This is right, as each dialect of a large family has its own history, and for this reason it is no wonder if a dialect often deviates from the primary forms found in the family, as one dialect may often retain forms belonging to the primitive source but discarded by the family in general; yet, we cannot conclude from this that the 'spared' *a* (*i*) of the ending in the older monuments produced the umlaut in some few stems (for even on this supposition we must consider these stems an exception to the general law, as we shall see later), since this *a* (*i*), be it now the suffixal *a*, as many believe, or the svarabhakti before *r* as others pretend, may possibly not have been retained till the umlaut period, a point which has entirely escaped Wimmer. Before ascribing the umlaut to its influence we must prove that it was actually present in the umlaut

period. Its presence at a former period justifies no inference as to the umlaut. Moreover I should like to object in regard to the comparison of *dohtrir* with the Greek *θυγατέρες* (which immediately follows in Wimmer), that the *-tar-* stems in Teutonic (at least in the other dialects) have suffered a transformation (cf. below), and only after conclusive evidence that the Old Norse has not shared in this transformation can the comparison be admitted. But I will not anticipate. The following investigation will, however, show whether we must take refuge behind a 'sparing' of the suffixal *a* (*i*) in this small number of stems, or whether these stems are not rather to be explained on Old Norse, Old English, and Old Frise ground in accord with the universal auslautsgesetz, or, perhaps, subject to peculiar modifications of the same in the respective languages, the principle being the same whether we accept a general or a special auslautsgesetz, viz., whether a whole class of words in one and the same language has been spared by the auslautsgesetz of that language, as this assumption demands.

The great question is whether this *a* of the ending *-as*, weakened to *i*, has been retained until after the appearance of the *i*-umlaut, or whether it had already dropped out before the *i*-umlaut period. This I believe I may emphatically deny, and for the following reasons. Let us assume with Heinzel, Ueber die Endsilben der altnordischen Sprache 4 (344), three periods of development in Old Norse: I. the oldest, in which the primitive forms that must be assumed as the base of the later forms still existed; II. the *i*-umlaut period; III. the period in which the present Old Norse forms became settled, which can be traced back to the reign of King Gorm. The third period forms the language of the manuscripts, and like periods I and II, marks distinctly one period of development in the language. Accordingly the presence of the *a* in the first period, out of which, according to Wimmer and others, the umlaut-working *i* was developed, is of no value whatever, as the umlaut period is the second. We must therefore expect to find the *a* (*i*) still present in period II if this theory of the umlaut is to prove tenable. It is not my intention, however, to enter here into a discussion of the quality of this *a* appearing in *a*-stems like *wiwAR*, *wolafAR*. This question has been fully discussed by Wimmer, Navneordenes Bøjning i aeldre Dansk, 40, 45, also in Aarb. 1867, 53, 1868, 72; Bugge: Tid. for fil. og paed. vi 317, vii 219; Gislason: Tid. for fil. og paed. vi 231-253, p. 31; Stevens, Aarb. 1867, 208, and Heinzel, ib. 30 (270), and the point, as above men-

tioned, is of minor importance. I will attempt a solution of the umlaut question in another manner; for if in fact this controversy should really turn out in favor of the real vowel *a* (*i*) or of the svarabhakti, it would not decide the umlaut at all, as even this *a* (*i*), although it was present in the first period in the *a*-stems (therefore only conjecturally in the consonant stems), had completely vanished in the second period (umlaut period, according to Heinzel, and justly, as far as the material at hand admits of a decision, cf. l. c. p. 30 [370]). It did not, therefore, survive the first period. Its presence in the second period must first be proved before use can be made of it to explain the umlaut. Let us get at the question however from another point of view. Are these really consonant stems or are they rather old *u*- and *i*-stems, and if so, how are their peculiarities to be explained? For it is only after we have proved that this declension really did start from a few consonant stems that we have need of an *a* (*i*) vowel to explain the umlaut. Here it will be necessary to enter into the history of the inner development of those declensions (*u*- and *i*-) out of which most of these stems (at least in Old Norse) passed into their present declension, in order to decide whether our peculiar declension could arise from these declensions.

Gislason was induced to assume *u*-stems for feminines like *bók*, *bót*, *rót*, *nótt*, *gás*, etc., because the *i*-stems (the feminines) show no umlaut in the n. ac. pl., so that he was utterly unable to explain them as *i*-stems; only *u*-stems have umlaut in the n. pl., but not in the ac. pl., retain, however, their vowel. The dropping of the vowel he did not attempt to explain, only citing analogous cases; the g. sg. *boekr*, *noetr*, *víkr*, etc., he left entirely unnoticed. Let us examine these two declensions and see in what cases the umlaut can regularly appear.

We will begin with Scherer's explanation of the masc. *i*-stems in Old Norse, which according to him are divided into umlauting or non-umlauting stems according as the suffixal vowel of the ending *-auas*, *-ajas*, is or is not colored to *i* inside of one and the same language. The appearance and non-appearance of the coloring is an indisputable fact, but why, on what conditions does it appear, on what remain away? Let us examine this question more minutely, as the solution of this problem is closely connected with the explanation of the umlaut.

The following cases are here to be considered: g. d. sg., n. ac. pl. According to Scherer they had the following endings in the primitive language: g. sg. *-auas*, *-ajas*, d. sg. *-aui*, *-aji*, n. pl. *-auas*, *-ajas*, ac. pl. *-uns*, *-ins*, therefore in the European, naturally

also in the primitive Teutonic, g. sg. *-euez*, *-ejez* (according to the prevailing opinion, but we shall immediately see that the g. sg. was really different), d. sg. *-eui*, *-eji* (later *-iui*, *-iji*), n. pl. *-euez*, *-ejez*. These endings must have given in Gothic according to Leffler's law (developed in his treatise, *Bidrag till lären om i- omljudet*, in *Tid. for fil. og paed. n. r. II* 1-20, 146-180, 231-320) g. sg. n. pl. *-jus*, *-eis*, d. sg. *-ju*, *-ei*; we find, however, g. sg. *-aus*, *-ais*, d. sg. *-au*, *-ai*, n. pl. *-jus*-, *eis*. Thus only the n. pl. of the Gothic has the properly developed form according to theoretical principles. What has stepped in to disturb the g. d. sg. in their regular development? The regular forms are found in the O. H. G. *ensti* (g. d. sg.), O. N. *naetr*, *boekr* (g. sg.), O. E. *byrig* (g. d. sg.), O. H. G. *henti* (g. d. sg.), O. N. *foeti*, *hendi* (d. sg.), O. E., O. Frise *fēt(i)* (d. sg.). Thus in one dialect the regular forms, in the others the irregular ones, nay sometimes both side by side in the same language.

Scherer's theory of caprice and accident in the coloring or non-coloring of the vowel is not at all satisfactory, though in fact the only explanation as yet offered. Since the publication of Scherer's book, however, many a point has become clear that was then dark, nay even enigmatical. If we apply what has recently been discovered to Scherer's explanation, we shall find that it was fundamentally right, though it was not caprice and accident that determined the coloring and non-coloring, but it was caused by the natural laws of development and justifiable in every particular case. Analogy and the laws of symmetrical adjustment then became very active in spreading this seeming irregular development.

The equality of the ending *-auas*, *-ajas*, in the g. sg. and n. pl. is only an apparent one; the two endings are qualitatively quite different as is shown by the Greek genitive in *-os*, Slav. *-e* and the genitives *yuktēs* and *mrdōs*; whereas the Greek n. pl. has *-es* (cf. De Saussure, *sur le système primitif des voyelles* 196). If we denote this qualitative difference between the ending of the g. sg. and n. pl. by *-au⁴s*, *-aj⁴s*, in the g. sg.; *-au¹ais*, *-aj¹ais*, in the n. pl. (following De Saussure), we shall then have in the g. sg. an ending (*-eu⁴s*, *-ej⁴s*) in the primitive Teutonic which cannot become *-iui^z*, *-ijiz* (i. e. Goth. *-jus*, *-eis*) according to Leffler's law which only allows *a* to change to (*e*) *i* when *i* (primitive or weakened from *a*¹) immediately follows, but must of necessity regularly

¹ *e* öfvergatt till *i* på grund af inverkan af det följande *j* eller ursprungliga *i*. *Tid. for fil. og paed. n. r. II* 4.

become in Gothic *-aus*, *-aïs*, as the ⁴ following *e* offered an insurmountable obstacle to the further transition to *i*: *-aus*, *-aïs*, are therefore the only justifiable endings of the genitive of *u*- and *i*-stems, the others that we occasionally find are subject to another explanation. As to the masculine *i*-stems in Gothic they have either wholly passed over into the *a*-declension or the singular is to be explained perhaps with De Saussure from **balgi⁴s*, thus the unaugmented ending as in the Greek *πόλιος*, which according to Leskien's conjecture, Deklination 28, 29, is also represented in Teutonic, and which will probably again appear in the genitive singular of *noetr*, *tíkr*, *byrig*, *ensti*.

The ending of the d. (loc.) *-aui*, *-aji*, is exceedingly difficult to explain: from *-aui*, *-aji*, we could only expect according to the known laws of development *-ju*, *-ei*, endings which really appear in the following forms: O. N. *merki* (= **markī*, for thus we must explain the *merkinni* in: *ok eptir þat sér hann koma fram ur merkinni einn mikinn ok stóran flugdreka*. Blómstrvallasaga 7. *ok kom þar ofurliga stórr risi fram ur merkinni*. ib. 38. *þeir föstein ljöpu or merkinni ok x menn aðrir*. Fms. I 206), O. E. *byrig* (= **burgī*), O. H. G., O. S. *ensti* (= **anstī*), O. N. *foeti*, *hendi*, O. E. *fēt(e)* beside *fôte*, O. H. G. *fuoizzi*, *hendi* (= **fōtju*, **handju*). These forms cannot come from the Gothic *anstai* and *fōtau*, but are the only regular representatives of the endings *-aui*, *-aji*; the Gothic forms and likewise the Old Saxon *sunu -o-*, Old English *sunu*, *handu*, Old Frise *sunu* (*-a-* = *-ā-* = *au*; cf. Scherer G. D. S. 435, Leskien Dek. 44) need another explanation.

The old locative early showed signs of having been formed in different ways, and here we must consider three methods of its formation from which the various forms of this case in Teutonic can be clearly accounted for: 1. the regular locative in *i* which is reflected in Teutonic by the forms just mentioned, and these correspond to the Sanskrit *sūndvi*, the Greek *νέχου*, and the Latin *fructui*; 2. the bare locative. The dropping of the *i* gives us in Sanskrit *udān*, *mūrdhān*, *cīrshān*, (cf., however, Osthoff in PB. III, 34), Lit. *awj* (cf. Bopp Vergl. Gramm.³ § 202, Leskien Dek. 52, Spiegel, Abaktr. Gramm. 132). 3. a locative formed by means of another suffix (*-ām* or *-ās*?), as in the Sanskrit ending *-āu* (for the *u*- and *i*-stems). Different explanations have been given for this last ending. Leskien Dek. 52 (cf. also 50, 51) justly assumes a dropping of the *i* (our second method) for the Slavonic, holds the Sanskrit *-āu* of the *u*- and *i*-stems to be the same method, whereby indeed there has been

a transfer of the *u*- form to the *i*- stems. Spiegel, Abaktr. Gramm. 132, 140, 141, with whom Schleicher Comp.⁴ 549-550 agrees, explains the locative endings *-a -ā -ō* of the *i*- stems and the *-a -ā -ō -āo* of the *u*- stems by the dropping of *-ji* and *-vi* from the fuller endings *-aji*, *-auī*. Benfey (Vollst. Gramm. 302²) believes the suffix *-au* of the *u*- stems in Sanskrit to be a contraction of *-auī*; on account of the near relationship of *y* and *v* the *i*- stems were drawn into this analogy. But none of these proposed explanations are exactly suited to the Teutonic; the *u*- stems could indeed be explained by the dropping of the *i*, as the ending *-au* would remain unaffected by the auslautsgesetz because of the heavy *timbre* of the *u*: an early disappearance of the *-i* in *-aji* would, however, give in the primitive Teutonic *-ai*, therefore necessarily in Gothic (unless we assume that the final *i* of the diphthong *-ai-* was exempted from the working of the auslautsgesetz, which the dative of the *a*- stems disproves) after the auslautsgesetz had operated, *-a* just as in the case of *fiska* (from primitive Teutonic **fiskai*). This may have been the case with the masculines, thus *balga* from a primitive **balg-aj (i)*, then **balgai* in early Teutonic and later through the loss of the final *i* by the working of the auslautsgesetz in Gothic *balga*. We have seen above that the genitive singular may possibly be from **balgi⁴s*, *balgis*. Thus we should have a regular development of the whole singular from the primitive forms without having to take recourse to a transition into the *a*- declension as these forms are generally explained. This, however, will not do with the feminines, as *anstai* points to an *anst-aj* + some vowel not having the nature of *e*, *i*. I am, therefore, all the more inclined to accept Bopp's explanation given in his Vergl. Gramm.³ § 198 (cf. also § 56^b) that the suffix *-āu* in the locative singular of the *u*- and *i*- stems stands for *-ās*, 'a kind of Attic, that is, enlarged genitive'; the *s* of the ending has become vocalized as sometimes the case with this letter in Sanskrit (cf. Bopp ib.), becoming in Sanskrit *u*, in other dialects *a*. Let us denote the primitive ending by *-āx*, where *x* denotes the unknown consonant, either *s* or *m*, as some have conjectured an *-ām*. The full ending will then be **-auāx*, *-ajāx*, which would give in Sanskrit after the vocalising of *x* zu *u* **-auāu*, **-ajāu*, where the *v* and *j*, after having assumed their consonant nature as they generally do between vowels, frequently drop out; this would give by contraction the required *-āu* in the dative of both the *u*- and *i*- stems. The endings *-a -ā -ō -āo* mentioned above can be as easily deduced from the endings assumed here by the vocalizing of the consonant *s* (or *m*)

as by the methods described above, and perhaps more satisfactorily. Nothing, however, could be more adapted to an explanation of the Gothic forms than these endings *-auûx*, *-ajûx*, which would give in primitive Teutonic *-auû*, *-ajû*; the weakening process constantly at work upon the final vowel (we have in the Old Baktrian forms the different stages in *-û -û -a*) would already have shortened the final *û* by the time of the appearance of the *auslautsgesetz*, hence the Gothic forms *-au*, *-ai* (from earlier *-aua*, *-aja*) by a regular process of development. Either this explanation or the explanation by the loss of the *i* (our second method) and the preservation of the diphthong intact (which seems improbable when we consider the masculine *i*-stems, g. sg. *balgiſ*, d. sg. *balga*), must be accepted as the regular endings; *-aui*, *-aji* cannot be admitted. The third method is open to the least objection and is on the whole the more satisfactory.

S. PRIMER.